

## Amusements To-Day.

**Ashley's Park Theatre**—The Oxford  
Academy—*Madame Tussaud's*  
**Bentley's Theatre**—*The Curious Case of*  
**Brownell's Museum**—*In Old New-York*  
**Bullock's Theatre**—*Martyrs*  
**Cinderella Museum**—*St. Helena*  
**General Drama Museum**—*Wise Men of the Woods*  
**Hannibal's Museum**—*The Bowery*  
**Hawkins's 13th St. Theatre**—*Patience*  
**Hawley's 4th Ave. Theatre**—*Shakspeare*  
**Madison Square Theatre**—*Leopold*  
**New Franklin Minstrels**—*Brooklyn and Belmont*  
**New York Minstrels**—*Leopold*  
**Thalia's Theatre**—*Leopold*  
**Theatre Bouguis**—*Madame Tussaud's*  
**Tony Pastor's Theatre**—*Patience*  
**Union Square Theatre**—*The Light of Life*—*Madame Tussaud's*  
**Whitack's Theatre**—*The Money-Spinners*  
**Windham's Theatre**—*Madame Tussaud's*

## The Large States and the Small States.

On opening the debate in the House on the bill for apportioning representatives under the last census, the usual conflict arose between the small States and the large States. The former complained that the latter had followed by ultimate victory, when the wisdom of completely abolishing religious tests, demonstrated in the United States, had been brought home to the British nation.

There seems to be no way of relieving the small States. Take New England, for example, which suffers a decline in membership under the pending bill. These six States do not increase in population so rapidly as the Middle and Western States; and of course the membership of the former must be reduced.

It is none the less irritating, however, to the shrewd, ambitious Yankees to see their power in the House steadily waning. In a Congress with hardly half as many representatives as the next will contain Maine had eight members. It will now get but four. For a long while New Hampshire had six members. It now must take up with two. Vermont, which in days gone by had six, now drops to one. Rhode Island has always had two members. The pending bill gives the State barely one. The time was when Connecticut had seven. It will now stand at four. When WEBSTER was first chosen to Congress from Boston, Massachusetts had fourteen representatives. The State has since grown in population, opulence, and wealth. But in a House twice as numerous as that wherein WEBSTER made his speech on the Greek revolution it can scarcely obtain twelve members. In short, under the pending bill, New England, which formerly elected one-eighth of the House, will be allowed to elect only one-thirteenth of it during the next ten years.

But New England finds compensation in the Senate, as do all the small States which look with envious eyes upon the increased representation of the large States in the House.

New England will have only twenty-four members in the House, but she retains her twelve Senators. The six States which lie immediately west of her, reaching from New York to Illinois, will have one hundred and twenty-five members under the new apportionment, or more than five times as many as the six New England States; but they have only their twenty Senators.

The enterprising sons of the Pilgrim land know how to utilize their power in the Senate. Their twelve Senators are Chairmen of six first-rate committees, and of five of the second class. But the twelve Senators from the other six States just referred to are Chairmen of only two important committees, and of five of an inferior grade. And thus it has been ever since the Republicans controlled the Senate.

When the smaller States grumble at the larger because of their increased membership in the House, the former must draw consolation from their comparatively superior power in the Senate.

## Again Barred Out of the House of Commons.

No sooner did the House of Commons consent on Tuesday than Mr. GLADSTONE, the member elect for Northampton, advanced to take the oath. His right to do so was challenged by the Conservative leader, and it was defended by the Ministry, who, however, suffered on this question, an overwhelming defeat. This is a bad beginning for the Cabinet, but the worst feature of their discomfiture was the disingenuous and shifting play by which Mr. GLADSTONE dealt a rude blow to his reputation for conscientious and unflinching adherence to high principles.

It will be remembered that the difficulties involved in the finding of a House of Commons for Mr. GLADSTONE's seat were bridged over in April, by permitting the member from Northampton to affirm instead of taking the oath. Mr. GLADSTONE, however, being subsequently arrested and tried on the charge of illegally sitting and voting in the House of Commons, no reason is apparent for further delaying the trial of that sergeant of artillery who endeavored to shoot him, though he was neither a Roman Catholic, a Jew, nor a Quaker, did not belong to the categories specially relieved from the obligation of pronouncing the oath prescribed by law. It was made clear by this decision that at following sessions unless Mr. BEADLAUGH should be sworn in, he could not take his seat at all.

Accordingly, in Mr. GLADSTONE's defense, they were doubtless influenced by both religious and political motives. We must bear in mind that most of them are Catholics, and while they might vote for the suppression of religious tests, they could hardly be expected to make sport of them, so long as they remain upon the statute book. Nor, when we recall what some of their colleagues have suffered and still suffer at the hands of the Government, can we blame them if they seize every opportunity to harass and overthrow the present Ministry.

As to the part taken by the Home Rulers in Mr. GLADSTONE's defense, they were doubtless influenced by both religious and political motives. We must bear in mind that most of them are Catholics, and while they might vote for the suppression of religious tests, they could hardly be expected to make sport of them, so long as they remain upon the statute book.

In the Senate of Washington yesterday the debate on the Pension Arrears act was continued. A constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture or sale of liquor was introduced.

In the House the debate on the Apportionment bill was continued. A bill for the appointment of a Tariff Commission of nine persons was reported; also a bill to establish postal savings banks. A bill was passed authorizing the Postmaster-General to adjust the claims of Postmasters for losses by unavoidable casualties.

## Why Not Try Sergeant Mason?

Now that GUITEAU has been convicted and sentenced, no reason is apparent for further delaying the trial of that sergeant of artillery who endeavored to shoot him, though he was neither a Roman Catholic, a Jew, nor a Quaker, did not belong to the categories specially relieved from the obligation of pronouncing the oath prescribed by law. It was made clear by this decision that at following sessions unless Mr. BEADLAUGH should be sworn in, he could not take his seat at all.

Accordingly, in Mr. GLADSTONE's defense, they were doubtless influenced by both religious and political motives. We must bear in mind that most of them are Catholics, and while they might vote for the suppression of religious tests, they could hardly be expected to make sport of them, so long as they remain upon the statute book.

Now that GUITEAU has been convicted and sentenced, no reason is apparent for further delaying the trial of that sergeant of artillery who endeavored to shoot him, though he was neither a Roman Catholic, a Jew, nor a Quaker, did not belong to the categories specially relieved from the obligation of pronouncing the oath prescribed by law. It was made clear by this decision that at following sessions unless Mr. BEADLAUGH should be sworn in, he could not take his seat at all.

It is true that neither the nature of GUITEAU's crime nor the issue of his trial properly had anything to do with the case of Mr. MASON, which was complete in itself; and a court of army officers should have been able to resist the influences of popular excitement in performing their military duty. Still, it is well known that, instead of a universal denunciation of MASON's act, as a disgrace to the army and to the country, he received substantial tokens of sympathy, and a subscription was begun to secure extra compensation to defend him.

But whatever the motives which caused the postponement of the court originally ordered to try him, they must now have ceased to operate. By due process of law the murderer of President GARFIELD has been found guilty and sentenced to death; and thus even the pretense with which the advocates of lynching justified themselves has disappeared.

On the other hand, there are grave reasons why the self-constituted executioners of GETTIEAU should be brought under the penalties of the law they delisted. There were two of these would-be assassins—imitators of GETTIEAU himself in the greed of notoriety. It is obvious that there is need of enforcing the law that trying to kill a murderer is a punishable crime. The newspaper which SNADEY pretended to have found in the GETTIEAU jury room contained an article which declared that if the prisoner continued his outbreaks in court, "no honest man" would kill him, and that "no jury could be found in the whole country to convict such a volunteer avenger." It is well to know whether the two men who really shot at GETTIEAU, while in the hands of justice, were really guilty.

One of the lessons from the condition into which the late snowball threw the streets is that a great number of people, to their infinite trouble, from the thoughtlessness of those they occupy. What the legal rights and what the possibilities are under existing charters and contracts, is another question. But with a proper system of strict supervision, the city might advantageously require fixed occupants of particular public streets, like the horse or steam car companies to clear them of snow, at least if not also of dirt. At present all the railroads are to clear their own tracks, by blocking up the rest of the thoroughfares. The snow ploughs and sweepers brush the snow into hills between the tracks and the curbstones. They quickly turn these hills into disgusting mounds of mud and filth in front of every home and every store along their line. Where the tracks are near

the houses, the snow often lies in drifts, and the sides of the houses are covered with mud and dirt. It must eventually become one of the other.

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

In Sergeant MASON's case there was the added offense of violating his duties as a soldier. He protested that standing guard over a murderer was disagreeable. No doubt he did as he supposed the troops to be enlisted

in God and in a future life.

In the event of such resistance, three courses were open to Mr. GLADSTONE. Professing, as he does, sincere belief in the doctrines of Christianity, he might have assumed the attitude which he originally took when the first controversy over BEADLAUGH's admission arose, and concurred with the Conservative leaders in refusing to sanction the prostitution of an oath by one who had publicly declared it to be "idle and meaningless, so far as it involved an appeal to the Policy to take note of the asseveration." Had Mr. GLADSTONE clung to this view, which, at first, as we have said, he instinctively adopted, he would at least have had the credit of consistent devotion to principle, and would have been sustained by those men, whether Non-conformists, Anglicans, or Catholics, with whom religious convictions have more weight than political expediency. The majority, however, of the Liberal party recognized the grave political consequences of such a step, and denied that, as a matter of constitutional law, the House of Commons had any right to take cognizance of the opinions entertained by a member who was willing to take the oath. This would be equivalent

to admitting that the troops to be enlisted

in God and in a future life.

In Sergeant MASON's case there was the added offense of violating his duties as a soldier. He protested that standing guard over a murderer was disagreeable. No doubt he did as he supposed the troops to be enlisted

in God and in a future life.

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who set my house afire, and my family, should not be punished."

Mr. J. R. T. says, "I don't see any reason why the two men who